

Comments on the proposal to remove the homonymy between PLUTONIINAE Bollman, 1893 (Arthropoda, Chilopoda) and PLUTONIINAE Cockerell, 1893 (Mollusca, Gastropoda)
(Case 2946; see BZN 52: 150–152)

(1) Philippe Bouchet

Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, 55 rue de Buffon, 75005 Paris, France

The application by Drs Shelley and Backeljau states that the subfamily PLUTONIINAE Bollman, based on the myriapod genus *Plutonium* Cavanna, 1881, is deemed to have been established on 30 November 1893, whilst PLUTONIINAE Cockerell, based on the snail genus *Plutonia* Morelet in Stabile, 1864, is dated 21 December 1893 and is thus the junior homonym.

However, an examination of the serial *The Conchologist* shows that vol. 2, part 8, in which the name PLUTONIINAE Cockerell was introduced (p. 186), was published on 31 October 1893. The blue wrapper of that issue, comprising pp. 185–232, bears the inscription: 'Double Number. December 21st, 1893. (Published October 31st)'.

This reverses the priority of the two names and PLUTONIINAE Cockerell has one month's priority over PLUTONIINAE Bollman.

(2) Thierry Backeljau

*Koninklijk Belgisch Instituut voor Natuurwetenschappen, Vautierstraat 29,
B-1040 Brussels, Belgium*

Rowland M. Shelley

*North Carolina State Museum of Natural Sciences, P.O. Box 29555, Raleigh,
North Carolina 27626-0555, U.S.A.*

Dr Bouchet has pointed out (above) that the molluscan family-group name PLUTONIINAE Cockerell was published on 31 October 1893, and not 21 December 1893 as stated in our application. The myriapod name PLUTONIINAE Bollman thus becomes the junior homonym.

In preparing our application one of us saw only a copy of Cockerell's paper and not the wrapper of the issue of *The Conchologist*, whilst the other unfortunately missed the small print at the top of the cover giving the date of publication.

The most logical and convenient solution now to this problem of homonymy is to amend the myriapod name to PLUTONIUMINAE under the Commission's plenary powers, whilst retaining the mollusc name unchanged as PLUTONIINAE, and we formally propose this.

Comments on the proposed conservation of the generic name *Glomeris* Latreille, 1802 (Diplopoda) and the specific name of *Armadillo vulgaris* Latreille, 1804 (Crustacea, Isopoda), and the application for a ruling on the status of the name *Armadillo* Latreille, 1802 (Crustacea, Isopoda)
(Case 2909; see BZN 52: 236–244)

The following comments have been received from members of the Nomenclature Committee of The Crustacean Society.

(1) Marcos Tavares

Instituto de Biologia, Universidade Santa Ursula, Rio de Janeiro, 22231-045 Brazil

The history of this case has been set out by Profs Lehtinen and Holthuis. The unused name *Armadillo* Cuvier, 1792 (Diplopoda) threatens two much-used names: *Armadillo* Latreille, (1802) (Isopoda) as a senior homonym and *Glomeris* Latreille, 1802 (Diplopoda) as a senior synonym. *Pentheus* C.L. Koch, [1841] is the next available name to replace *Armadillo* Latreille but has been used only once (by Dahl, 1916; see para. 14 of the application). The authors of the application agree that *Armadillo* Cuvier should be suppressed; however, they do not share the same view on whether the name *Armadillo* Latreille should be maintained, and advocate different solutions to this problem.

Prof Lehtinen proposes that *Armadillo* Cuvier be suppressed for priority but not homonymy, and that *Armadillo* Latreille be replaced by *Pentheus*. Prof Holthuis advocates that *Armadillo* Cuvier be suppressed for priority and also homonymy, so conserving *Armadillo* Latreille; he records that the latter has been well used and there is a family-group name based on it, whereas *Pentheus* has been used only once.

I believe that Prof Holthuis's proposal will best serve stability and universality of nomenclature. It is a much simpler solution, it preserves a name that has been much used, and it avoids unnecessarily reintroducing the name *Pentheus* which was used for the only time in 1916.

(2) Gary C.B. Poore

Museum of Victoria, 71 Victoria Crescent, Abbotsford, Victoria 3067, Australia

This is a complex case and one in which a strict application of the Code would cause great confusion. There is a real chance that a ruling in favour of *Pentheus* would be largely ignored by those ecologists and physiologists with little interest in the intricacies of the rules of zoological nomenclature.

I am in favour, therefore, of following the recommendations of Prof Holthuis and conserving *Armadillo* Latreille, 1802.

(3) A.B. Williams

NOAA/NMFS Systematics Laboratory, NHB 163, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.

Profs P.T. Lehtinen and L.B. Holthuis discuss the bewildering history of generic and specific names that date from Linnaeus (1758), involving composite concepts, neglect, substitution, use and disuse, changes in rules, homonymy and synonymy, together with placement on and withdrawal from the Official List. Anchorage of names to originally described material is impossible.

The proposal to conserve the generic name *Glomeris* Latreille, 1802 (Diplopoda, a conglobating millipede) and the specific name of *Armadillo vulgaris* Latreille, 1804 (Isopoda, a conglobating woodlouse) by the suppression of long-disused senior synonyms seems well supported and favoured.

Armadillo Latreille, 1802 has long been in use, with three, four or more papers listed every year and a family name based on it, though it is formally invalid unless conserved by the Commission. If not, it would be replaced by the synonym *Pentheus* C.L. Koch, [1841], used only once (Dahl, 1916) since proposed; there is no family-group name based on it. In essence, the case concerns the strict priority of a generic name which has been used only twice in over 150 years, or the conservation of a name used repeatedly for nearly 200 years. I support the conservation of *Armadillo* Latreille, 1802.

Comments on the proposed conservation of the generic names *Monstrilla* Dana, 1849 and *Thaumaleus* Krøyer, 1849 (Crustacea, Copepoda)
(Case 2894; see BZN 52: 245–249)

(1) David M. Damkaer

21318 195th Avenue SE, Monroe, Washington 98272 9481, U.S.A.

I agree with Dr Grygier that retaining the essentially unused name *Thaumatoessa* Krøyer in Gaimard, [1842] would jeopardize the established nomenclature of these parasitic copepods. In 1849 the author himself rejected the name by giving a new generic name, *Thaumaleus*, to the same specimen. Krøyer did not comment on the name change but he was enamoured with Greek and perhaps perceived some subtle difficulty with grammar or usage.

Krøyer's name *Thaumatoessa* predates Dana's (1849) widely used name *Monstrilla* and, as proposed in the application, should be suppressed to retain stability in Monstrilloida nomenclature. Krøyer's (1849) later and well-used name *Thaumaleus* will also be conserved for use by those who separate this taxon from *Monstrilla*.

The name *Thaumatoessa* Krøyer is of uncertain date but was likely published between 1842 and 1845. Damkaer & Damkaer (1979) chose 1845 as the most conservative date for publication, even though evidence pointed mainly toward an earlier date (para. 1 of the application). Regardless of which date is accepted, the problem with *Thaumatoessa* remains and its seniority relative to *Monstrilla* and *Thaumaleus* is unchanged.

The following comments have been received from members of the Nomenclature Committee of The Crustacean Society.

(2) A.B. Williams

NOAA/NMFS Systematics Laboratory, NHB 163, Smithsonian Institution,
Washington, DC 20560, U.S.A.

M.J. Grygier has pointed out the almost complete disuse of the name *Thaumatoessa* Krøyer, [1842], which was based on an illustration. There were only three uses of the name for copepods in the period 1842–1868. *Monstrilla* Dana, 1849, the name for the type genus of the MONSTRILLIDAE and the Monstrilloida, is in current